DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 036 UD 014 351

AUTHOR Crawley, Nora S.; Evans, Dale
TITLE A Total Approach to Learning with an Emphasis on Reading and Math: Carter Elementary School, 1972-73. Research and Development Report, Vol. 7, No. 43, March 1974.
INSTITUTION Atlanta Public Schools, Ga.
PUB DATE Mar 74
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; Cross Age Teaching; Day Care Programs; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Diagnosis; *Elementary Schools; Federal Aid; High School Students; *Inner City; Negro Students; Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Reading; Trainable Mentally Handicapped
IDENTIFIERS *Georgia

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to provide data on the educational program at E. R. Carter Elementary School with a focus on several specific programs. Carter is located in close proximity to downtown Atlanta. Its pupil population was entirely Negro while the faculty itself was well integrated. The economic level was generally low. The purpose of the English-Reading Program, funded under Title I of the 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act, was to provide remedial reading instruction for children who were identified as "slow learners" by standardized tests and by teacher observation and judgment. Results from the Comprehensive Instructional Program tests and other tests were used as criteria for grouping the children for the type of instruction prescribed for each child. The Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program involved 10 tutors and 20 tutees. The tutors were students from a nearby high school. The tutees were students who were enrolled as slow learners and who were enrolled in Title I English-Reading classes at Carter. The Tutor-Buddy or Experience Approach in Reading was a Title I program established for Title I pupils to tutor Trainable Mentally Retarded children. The Title IV-A Child Development Center, funded under the 1967 Amendment of the Social Security Program, had approximately 40 children. (Author/JM)

ED 094036

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Vol. VII, No. 43 March, 1974

A TOTAL APPROACH TO LEARNING WITH AN EMPHASIS ON READING AND MATH

CARTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
1972-73

Charles Hawk
Principal

Eleanor Fowler
Lead Teacher

Prepared by

Nora S. Crawley
Research Assistant

Dale Evans
Statistician

Dr. Jarvis Barnes
Assistant Superintendent
for Research and Development

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Alonzo A. Crim
Superintendent

Atlanta Public Schools
224 Central Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

UD 014 354

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
RATIONALE	1
NEEDS OF THE PARTICIPANTS	3
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND CRITICAL VARIABLES	
Goal A	3
Behavioral Objective	3
Goal B	4
Behavioral Objective	4
Goal C	4
Behavioral Objective	4
Goal D	4
Behavioral Objective	4
Goal E	4
Behavioral Objective	5
MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL	5
PROCESS	8
EVALUATION	
Title I English-Reading	13
Title I Youth-Tutoring-Youth	17
Title I Tutor-Buddy	18
Acceptability Goal Evaluation	19
Comprehensive Child Development Goal	21
COST ANALYSIS	23
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	25
APPENDIX	
School Organizational Development Questionnaire	A-1

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1	E.R. Carter Elementary Responses of Teachers and Aides to the School Organizational Development Questionnaire, February 1973	6
2	Reading Gains Between Pretest and Posttest as Measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Title I Pupils, 1972-73	13
3	School Sentiment Index Posttest Scores Title I, Primary Level, 1972-73	15
4	School Sentiment Index Posttest Scores Control Group, Primary Level, 1972-73	15
5	School Sentiment Index Posttest Scores Title I, Intermediate Level, 1972-73	16
6	School Sentiment Index Posttest Scores Control Group, Intermediate Level, 1972-73	16
7	Reading Gains on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Title I, Youth-Tutoring-Youth Pupils, 1972-73	17
8	Reading Gains on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Title I, Tutor Buddy Pupils, 1972-73	18
9	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, April, 1973, Predicted Scores and National Norms	20
10	Scoring on Southern Regional Education Board's Scale Child Development Center, 1972-73	22
11	Cost Analysis, 1972-73	24

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide data on the educational program at E.R. Carter Elementary School with a focus on several specific programs. The time period of this report is the 1972-73 school year. The information included in this report will permit persons at Carter to reflect on accomplishments for the school year and to evaluate the reasons why some of the goals for 1972-73 were not attained. It will also serve as a report to other school and non-school persons about the educational program at Carter.

In addition to the regular Atlanta Board of Education funds, Carter had the following federally funded programs: Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), English-Reading Program; Title I, ESEA, Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program; Title I, ESEA, Tutor-Buddy Program; and Title IV-A, the 1967 Amendment to the Social Security Act, Child Development Program. These programs will receive special attention in the analysis of the data on the educational program.

II. RATIONALE

Carter is located in close proximity to downtown Atlanta and is one of six elementary feeder schools for the Kennedy Middle School in Area I of the Atlanta Public Schools. Its pupil population was entirely Negro while the faculty itself was well integrated. The economic level was generally low because the survey conducted for the purposes of Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), indicated approximately 66 per cent of the pupils in the Carter attendance area were from families with a yearly income of $2,000 or less.

In May of 1973, the total enrollment in kindergarten through the seventh grade at Carter was 589 pupils which was a decrease from the May, 1972 enrollment of 603. One reason for the decrease was the loss of most sixth and seventh grade pupils to Kennedy Middle School. The following personnel served these pupils:

Number	Title	Assignment
21	Classroom Teachers	Full Time
1	Educable Mentally Retarded Teacher	Full Time
1	Librarian	Full Time
1	Music Teacher	.6

Number	Title	Assignment
1	Band Teacher	.2
1	Art Teacher	.6
1	Speech Teacher	.2
2	Title I English-Reading Teachers	Full Time
4	Educational Aides	Full Time

In addition to the 589 pupils served by this staff, Carter had a Child Development Program with approximately thirty-four children enrolled and an Extended Day Program for the siblings of the children in the Child Development Program. This Child Development Program was sponsored by Title IV-A of the 1967 Amendment to the Social Security Act. The program served pupils in the Carter attendance area. There were approximately 34 pupils, ages two through four, enrolled in the Child Development Program for the 1972-73 school year and there were approximately 27 enrolled in the Extended Day Program. The total staff which served these pupils included the following:

Number	Title	Assignment
1	Lead Teacher	Full Time
3	Group Leaders	Full Time
4	Educational Aides	Full Time

The number of pupils enrolled in the Child Development Program remained fairly stable throughout the year even though there were changes in the pupils comprising the group. On several occasions during the school year, there were changes in the guidelines about eligibility for enrollment in the Child Development Program. This necessitated the removal of some pupils from the program and the addition of others to it.

During the 1972-73 school year, attendance at Carter was quite good. The following was the percentage of pupils in attendance for nine reporting periods, each of which consisted of 20 days:

Period	Per Cent
First	96
Second	95
Third	94
Fourth	93
Fifth	93
Sixth	93
Seventh	93
Eighth	91
Ninth	92
Average for the Year	92

The city-wide attendance level was 91.4 per cent: therefore, Carter's pupil attendance was above the city-wide level.

The mobility index at Carter for the 1972-73 school year was .21. This indicated that the pupil population at Carter was fairly stable and not too mobile when compared to other Title I schools. Yet, the .21 was a substantial increase from the 1970-71 index of .13.

Combining the fairly high percentage of attendance and the generally low mobility index, it is feasible to conclude that the faculty at Carter had a fairly stable, low absentee group of pupils with which to to work.

III. NEEDS OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Because of the high percentage of Title I, ESEA pupils at Carter, there is the ever present reading problem as well as the generally low self-concept and attitude toward school of these pupils in the lower socio-economic category. There were also many preschool-age pupils from low-income, one-parent families, usually matriarchial in nature, whose parent could not afford day care for her children. In addition to the inability to afford such care, the home environment of a parent such as this is often lacking in stimulation which a child needs before he or she is ready to begin kindergarten. Finally, this parental need for day care is accompanied by a need for employment training, but the latter cannot be accomplished if the former is not available. In order to meet the general and specific needs of the Carter pupils, which were identified at the close of the 1971-72 school year, a number of programs were operated which were expected to have a positive effect in meeting these needs.

IV. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND CRITICAL VARIABLES

Goal A:

To improve the reading, self-concept, and attitude towards school of the most educationally disadvantaged pupils at Carter, who are hereafter identified as Title I English-Reading pupils.

Behavioral Objective:

The Title I, English-Reading pupils will show a gain of at least one month for each month of instruction in the following areas: word knowledge, word analysis, and reading. The identified pupils will demonstrate a more positive

attitude towards school and a higher self-concept than similar pupils who did not participate.

Goal B:

To improve the reading scores of a selected group of Title I English-Reading pupils who participated in a Youth-Tutoring-Youth program; these pupils are hereafter identified as Youth-Tutoring-Youth tutees. These elementary pupils will be tutored by high school pupils who were identified as poor readers.

Behavioral Objective:

Title I Youth-Tutoring-Youth tutees, given the opportunity to participate in a Youth-Tutoring-Youth program, will make greater gains in reading as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) than Title I pupils who did not participate.

Goal C:

To improve the reading scores of 15 of the lowest Title I English-Reading pupils. These 15 elementary pupils will participate in an experience approach to becoming better readers.

Behavioral Objective:

Title I Tutor-Buddy pupils, given the opportunity to participate in the Tutor-Buddy program, will make greater gains in reading as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) than Title I pupils who did not participate.

Goal D:

To increase the reading and mathematics abilities of the school-age pupils to the acceptable level or national norm.

Behavioral Objective:

The school population will attain the acceptable level (national norm) on the achievement test administered city wide.

Goal E:

To provide model day care services for children, ages two through four, from one-parent families who qualify as welfare recipients.

Behavioral Objective:

Given the opportunity to participate in a twelve-month child development program, two through four-year-old youngsters from low-income families will develop a positive self-image, oral language skills, and concept formation equivalent to or above age norms as measured by the rating scale of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB).

The critical variables for the goals and objectives were as follows:

A. Extremely poor reading scores, evidence of low self-concepts and poor attitude toward school of the pupils identified as Title I.

B. A fairly low acceptability rate for reading (70 for 1971-72) and for mathematics (80 for 1971-72).

C. Generally low cognitive ability, social skills, emotional maturity and physical development of about 40 preschool-age pupils from low-income, one-parent families.

V. MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL

The principal at Carter was extremely efficient in informing his faculty about its responsibilities and providing the faculty with essential information. At the beginning of the school year, a teacher's handbook was distributed to each teacher. This handbook contained a wealth of information about the Carter program in specific and about the school system in general. The handbook included such diverse items as: a tentative agenda for staff meetings and parent-teacher association programs, the city-wide test schedule, the salary schedule for the 1972-73 school year, and a tentative schedule for the distribution of payroll checks.

In February of 1973, the faculty at Carter responded to an organizational climate questionnaire developed by Dr. David J. Mullen. Dr. Mullen's instrument, the School Organizational Development Questionnaire, includes 47 statements to which a response was made. (See Appendix for a copy of the instrument.) The respondent indicated both how he would like the situation to be and also how it actually was. The entire faculty at Carter, teachers and aides, responded to the questionnaire and the results indicated a generally favorable climate at Carter because none of the mean scores fell below 2.78, and 5.00 would have been the perfect response. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1

E.R. CARTER ELEMENTARY RESPONSES OF TEACHERS AND AIDES TO THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
February, 1973

Leadership Processes

Questions 1 - 5	As you would like it						As it is					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Teachers (N = 25)	0	4	12	31	74	4.45	12	23	14	32	32	3.43
Aides (N = 4)	0	0	6	2	10	4.22	0	2	8	2	8	3.80
Total	0	4	18	33	84	4.42	12	25	22	34	40	3.49

Motivational Forces

Questions 6 - 13												
Teachers (N = 25)	0	4	14	52	128	4.54	10	46	45	50	43	3.36
Aides (N = 4)	0	2	0	15	7	4.13	0	7	6	10	8	3.61
Total	0	6	14	67	135	4.49	10	53	51	60	51	3.40

Communication Processes

Questions 14 - 23												
Teachers (N = 25)	2	20	34	93	94	4.06	12	61	63	72	34	3.23
Aides (N = 4)	0	10	5	7	6	3.32	0	10	8	8	7	3.36
Total	2	30	39	100	100	3.98	12	71	71	80	41	3.24

Interaction-Influence Processes

Questions 24 - 28												
Teachers (N = 25)	1	14	11	49	45	4.03	10	49	23	28	13	2.88
Aides (N = 4)	1	4	0	6	4	3.53	0	5	2	5	7	3.74
Total	2	18	11	55	49	3.97	10	54	25	33	20	2.99

TABLE 1 (Cont'd)

Decision-Making Processes

Questions 29 - 35	As you would like it						As it is					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Teachers (N = 25)	1	9	14	62	78	4.26	17	74	35	31	15	2.73
Aides (N = 4)	2	3	2	10	4	3.52	3	8	5	4	7	3.15
Total	3	12	16	72	82	4.18	20	82	40	35	22	2.78

Goal Setting

Questions 36 - 38												
Teachers (N = 25)	1	0	6	22	40	4.45	5	15	13	20	20	3.48
Aides	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	2	1	4	2	2	3.09
Total	2	0	8	26	40	4.34	7	16	17	22	22	3.43

Control Processes

Questions 39 - 43												
Teachers (N = 25)	0	2	8	37	68	4.49	3	31	31	30	23	3.33
Aides (N = 4)	1	5	4	3	1	2.86	2	3	8	3	4	3.20
Total	1	7	12	40	69	4.31	5	34	39	33	27	3.31

Performance and Training

Questions 44 - 47												
Teachers (N = 25)	0	3	6	21	66	4.56	1	12	18	26	41	3.96
Aides	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	0	1	2	7	5	4.07
Total	0	3	7	28	70	4.53	1	13	20	33	46	3.97

Key

1. Never
2. Sometimes
3. Often
4. Very Often
5. Always

In Table 1 the responses of the Carter faculty to the Mullen instrument are enumerated. The eight categories of the instruments are: leadership processes, motivational forces, communication processes, interaction-influence processes, decision-making processes, goal setting, control processes, and performance and training. In almost every case, the mean response for the ideal situation, or the "as you would like it," was higher in all eight subcategories than the mean responses for "as it is." The exceptions for this were the aides' responses in the subcategories of motivational forces, communication processes, interaction-influence processes and control processes. The aides were, as non-professionals, less assertive than teachers, so this discrepancy was not surprising. Also, the small number of aides (which was four), compared to 25 teachers reduces the validity of their responses.

The greatest management/control problem experienced at Carter resulted from the loss of some Title IV-A, of the 1967 Amendment of the Social Security Act funds. The Title IV-A educational aides who were identified at the beginning of the school year were primarily parents who assisted with the reading program during the school day and in the extended day program after school. These Title IV-A educational aides were dismissed after funds were drastically cut. There was resentment against the school for "hiring and then firing them." Even though the school was not responsible for the loss of funds, it was the most visible institution which could be attacked.

VI. PROCESS

In September of 1972, Carter, working with a Research Assistant from the Research and Development Division, prepared a prospectus which stated the needs, goals, objectives, activities and evaluation plans for the 1972-73 school year. In September of 1972, the Carter prospectus included two Title IV-A, the 1967 Amendment of the Social Security Act programs, which were removed from the school after the federal government reduced funds. The two programs which were dropped included the Title IV-A Communication Skills Laboratory and the Title IV-A Extended Day Program. Thus, the federally funded programs at Carter which existed for all or the majority of the school year were: Title I English-Reading; Title I Youth-Tutoring-Youth; Title I Tutor-Buddy; and Title IV-A Child Development Program. Each of these conducted activities were to attain its previously stated goals. The person at Carter who was responsible for each of these programs was asked to prepare a summary of the activities conducted during the year.

The lead teacher responsible for the Title I English-Reading Program submitted the following summary of activities:

The purpose of this program was to provide remedial reading instruction for children who were identified as "slow learners" by standardized tests and by teacher observation and judgment.

Results from the Comprehensive Instructional Program (CIP) tests and the Aaron Diagnostic Tests were used as criteria for grouping the children for the type of instruction prescribed for each child. Also, satisfactory results were obtained by interest grouping.

With the assistance of educational aides, each child was given as much individual attention as time permitted.

Based on diagnostic findings, instructional activities included the following reading skills:

A. Hearing differences in words

B. Hearing similar beginning and ending sounds

C. Matching letters

D. Hearing rhyming words

E. Recognition of capital and lower case letters

F. Basic sight vocabulary

G. Recognition of initial and final consonant and vowel sounds and blends

H. Hearing syllables, finding root words, finding roots in compounds and contractions

I. Reading to get the main idea

J. Discriminating between fact, opinion, and fiction

K. Reading for details

L. Using reference aids

M. Other comprehension skills.

These skills in broad terms centered around vocabulary development, phonetic/word analysis, and comprehension. Folders were kept

containing all of the student's corrected work in each of the areas listed. To encourage weekly vocabulary growth, prizes were earned by the pupils.

During the course of the program, conferences were held with the teachers of the Title I children so as to determine additional needs of the children, and progress reports were sent so that the teachers could see the kinds of activities being carried out, and to give them ideas as to how they might follow-up or re-teach specific skills.

The projected gain of one month for each month in the area of instruction was not realized and was felt to be unrealistic for these children. However, progress has been made by these students and can be observed through pupil response and informal testing.

The final two weeks of the school year were spent by the entire Title I staff in program evaluation, program preparation for next school year, and in closing out our reading centers.

The educational aide responsible for coordinating the activities of the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program submitted the following summary of activities:

The Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program at E.R. Carter Elementary School involved ten tutors and twenty tutees. The tutors were students from a nearby high school. The tutees were students who were identified as slow learners, and who were enrolled in Title I English-Reading classes at Carter. The tutors worked under the supervision of the educational aide who consulted with the homeroom teachers regarding the type of assistance each child should receive. Following is a list of activities included in the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program for the school year:

A. Storytelling

B. Writing experience stories

C. Activities using the newspaper, phone book, and magazines

D. Viewing films and film strips

E. Supervised play periods

F. Listening to recordings (phonics, stories, etc.)

G. Assistance with reading skills (workbooks other than those used in the classroom are utilized for the activity.)

H. Work crossword puzzles

I. Free reading periods

J. Field trips and follow-up activities

K. Tutors assist tutees with homework assignments

L. Play games (e.g. listen to books, and other word games)

M. Rap sessions (sharing experiences, discussion of manners, etc.).

The chief purpose of this program was to help children attain success in the language arts area, and to develop a feeling of independence which could enable them to work in the classroom along with other children, with as little frustration and embarrassment as possible.

An atmosphere of big sister, big brother relationship was an important factor in this tutorial program.

The educational aide responsible for coordinating the activities of the Tutor-Buddy Program submitted the following summary of activities:

The Tutor-Buddy or Experience Approach In Reading was a Title I program established for Title I pupils to tutor Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR) children. Fifteen Title I pupils at Carter were tutor buddies to handicapped tutees at the John F. Kennedy Center. Visitations by Carter tutors to Kennedy were on a weekly basis. During the tutorial periods, educational games in the area of reading were played so that learning experiences could be reaped by the tutees. Frequently, tutors and tutees lunched together -- talking out and sharing experiences, thereby giving both groups further opportunity for language growth. Several field trips and weekend camp trips were taken. During these trips many pictures were taken -- capturing the memorable experiences of the tutors and tutees. From the pictures, tutors and tutees wrote stories, poems, and songs.

Staff members for this program included one aide, one lead teacher, and a graduate assistant who provided language instruction at Carter for the tutors.

The lead teacher responsible for coordinating the Title IV-A Child Development Center submitted the following summary of activities:

> The Carter Center had approximately 40 children in two units that included lavatories. Each unit had two group leaders with three aides and one floating aide used for supply when one was absent and also as a health assistant to the Family Service Worker who headed the Health Program. A group leader was present in the Center at all times; therefore, one group leader was present in the morning and the other in the afternoon.
>
> Planning with the lead teacher was done daily with all staff members from 1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m. The lead teacher directed the Center's activities and provided leadership for the staff. She arranged schedules, conducted staff meetings, and planned and maintained equipment and materials.
>
> Parents were required to participate in observation in the Center, work in small groups or with one child, be involved in field trips and in parent workshops where games were made for use in the Center and at home to develop reading readiness skills and cognitive development areas under the guidance of the Family Service Worker.
>
> The Family Service Worker developed parent involvement programs, assisted group leaders in working with parents, observed in the Center and headed the Health Program. She also helped parents find jobs or training according to their interests and skills.
>
> The funds for the Program provided for component services such as health and medical services, dental examinations and services, nutritional services, preventive and remedial educational services and recreational programs.
>
> Group leaders and aides in the Center were required to complete the two-year course in Child Development at Atlanta Area Technical School or some other institution. At the end of the two-year training, some aides were promoted to group leader positions according to their skill, personality and attitude in working with children.
>
> The children in the Center were developed intellectually, socially, mentally, and physically. Experiences were provided for improving muscular coordination and development of a better self-concept. These children should have readiness concepts which children who have had no preschool training do not have.

It must be remembered that the activities listed were carried on in addition to the regular classroom instruction which was a part of the program at Carter.

VII. EVALUATION

The research design to evaluate the goals which were stated in Section IV will be enumerated for each of the programs to be evaluated.

A. Title I English-Reading

The reading component of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) was administered pre and post to those pupils identified as Title I. The gain scores were used to evaluate the goal of one month's gain in reading for each month of instruction. The pretest was administered in October of 1972 and the posttest was administered in April of 1973. (See Table 2.)

TABLE 2

READING GAINS BETWEEN PRETEST AND POSTTEST
AS MEASURED BY THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
TITLE I PUPILS
1972-73

Grade	2	3	4	5	6	7	Overall Avg. Gain
Gain	.6	.3	.3	.3	.5	.6	.4
Number of Pupils	19.0	23.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.00

Table 2 contains the data to evaluate the goal of one month's gain in reading for each month of instruction. There were only two grade levels for which the goal was attained, the second and the seventh grade pupils. The sixth grade pupils with a gain of five months were relatively close to the goal, but the three month's gain for the third, fourth, and fifth grades was well below the goal of six months gain. When the gains for all pupils were averaged, the gain was only four months. Based on the analysis of the data listed, the English-Reading goal was not attained.

Several factors contributed to non-attainment of the Title I, English-Reading goal. One factor was the upheaval caused by the loss of Title IV-A of the Social Security Act funds. Some of the personnel at Carter who were working with the Title IV-A program were reassigned to work with the Title I pupils and therefore rescheduling of the tutoring sessions was necessary. A second factor was the high attrition rate of the Title I pupils. The personnel at Carter maintained their work with the 94 pupils who were the most educationally disadvantaged in reading, but pre and post tests were available for only 61. Thus, for 33 pupils, or approximately one-third, we have no data. A third factor was the generally poor pupil attitude towards tests. These pupils were involved in quite a few testing sessions and became test weary in the spring.

The School Sentiment Index (SSI) developed by the Educational Objectives Exchange in California, was administered to both Title I and non-Title I pupils to evaluate the goal of a more positive attitude towards school of the Title I pupils. The percentage of favorable responses for the Title I pupils was compared to the percentage of favorable responses for non-Title I pupils to measure attainment of the Title I affective goal.

The nature of the SSI requires administration of different forms for primary and intermediate level pupils. Therefore, four tables are required to present the data for evaluation of this affective goal. Table 3 contains the data for the Title I primary pupils; Table 4 contains the data for the control group of primary pupils; Table 5 contains the data for the Title I intermediate pupils; and Table 6 contains the data for the control group of intermediate pupils.

TABLE 3

SCHOOL SENTIMENT INDEX POSTTEST SCORES
TITLE I, PRIMARY LEVEL
1972-73

Group	Teacher	School Subject	School Social Structure and Climate	Peer	General	Overall Average
Second Grade N = 28	63	82	57	71	71	68.8
Third Grade N = 34	66	71	60	63	55	63.0
Fourth Grade N = 9	56	49	59	48	56	53.6

TABLE 4

SCHOOL SENTIMENT INDEX POSTTEST SCORES
CONTROL GROUP, PRIMARY LEVEL
1972-73

Group	Teacher	School Subject	School Social Structure and Climate	Peer	General	Overall Average
Second Grade N = 27	65	90	68	66	77	73.5
Third Grade N = 30	73	81	74	67	69	72.8
Fourth Grade N = 8	69	66	65	64	81	69.0

TABLE 5

SCHOOL SENTIMENT INDEX POSTTEST SCORES
TITLE I, INTERMEDIATE LEVEL
1972-73

Group	Peer	Teacher	General	School	Learning	Overall Average
Fifth Grade N = 7	64	62	75	54	69	64.8
Sixth Grade N = 5	70	50	53	50	53	55.2
Seventh Grade N = 6	82	69	69	59	39	63.6

TABLE 6

SCHOOL SENTIMENT INDEX POSTTEST SCORES
CONTROL GROUP, INTERMEDIATE LEVEL
1972-73

Group	Peer	Teacher	General	School	Learning	Overall Average
Fifth Grade N = 7	57	63	71	51	71	62.6
Sixth Grade N = 6	72	65	65	61	47	65.0
Seventh Grade N = 8	84	76	79	75	56	74.0

Comparing the data for the primary level pupils, in Tables 3 and 4, the Title I pupils in the second, third, and fourth grades, were all below the percentage of favorable responses for the non-Title I pupils in these same grades. Therefore, the affective goal was not attained for any grade for the Title I primary level pupils.

Comparing the data for the intermediate level pupils in Tables 5 and 6, the Title I pupils in the fifth grade were the only ones with a higher favorable percentage response. The sixth and seventh grade Title I pupils were below the favorable responses for the non-Title I sixth and seventh grade pupils. Therefore, the affective goal was attained for only one grade level (fifth) for the Title I intermediate level pupils.

Several factors attributed to non-attainment of the affective goal. First, the improvement in self-concept and attitude towards school was a corollary to the reading goal. The reading goal was not attained and failure in the affective area is not surprising. A second possible factor is the lack of pre and post data for the Title I and non-Title I pupils. The School Sentiment Index (SSI) was given to Title I and non-Title I pupils in the fall of 1972, but the test administrators failed to separate Title I and non-Title I results. A third possible factor is the overemphasis on reading with little assistance or time allotted for affective activities.

B. Title I Youth-Tutoring-Youth

Using the reading component scores from the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) administered to all Title I pupils, the gain scores of the pupils enrolled in the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program were compared to the gain scores of the Title I pupils who were not enrolled. The goal was a higher gain score in reading for the Youth-Tutoring-Youth (YTY) pupils when their scores were compared to other Title I pupils. Table 7 contains the data evaluating attainment of this goal.

TABLE 7

READING GAINS ON THE
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
TITLE I, YOUTH-TUTORING-YOUTH PUPILS
1972-73

Program	Number of Pupils	Gradewise Gain 3rd	4th	5th	6th	Average Gain
YTY	17	.3	.4	*	1.3	.7
Title I	37	.3	.3	.3	.5	.4

*There were no fifth grade pupils identified in the YTY program who took both the pre and post Metropolitan Achievement Tests.

As can be determined by analyzing the data in Table 7, only Youth-Tutoring-Youth (YTY) pupils in grades three, four, and sixth had both pre and post Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) data available. Based on the available data, the YTY pupils did achieve greater gains in reading than the other Title I pupils who did not participate in this special program. The average gain in reading for the YTY pupils was seven months while other Title I pupils made a gain of four months.

Based on the data presented in Table 7, the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program's goal was attained.

C. Title I Tutor-Buddy

Using the reading component scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) administered to all Title I pupils, the gain scores of the pupils enrolled in the Tutor-Buddy Program were compared to the gain scores of the Title I pupils not enrolled. The goal was a higher gain score in reading for the Tutor-Buddy pupils when their scores were compared to other Title I pupils. Table 8 contains the data evaluating attainment of this goal.

TABLE 8

READING GAINS ON
THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
TITLE I, TUTOR BUDDY PUPILS
1972-73

Program	Number of Pupils	Gradewise Gain 6th	Gradewise Gain 7th	Average Gain
Tutor Buddy	9	.9	.6	.8
Title I	10	.5	.6	.6

As can be determined by analyzing the data in Table 8, the Tutor-Buddy pupils did achieve greater gains than the other Title I pupils who did not participate in this special program. The average gain in reading for the Tutor-Buddy pupils was eight months while other Title I pupils made a gain of only six months.

Based on the data presented in Table 8, the Tutor-Buddy Program's goal was attained.

D. Acceptability Goal Evaluation

An acceptability score was obtained for each grade at Carter Elementary School; this score was a comparison of the total on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) with the national norm on the same test. The goal for Carter was that each grade level would be at the national norm level on the Spring, 1973 ITBS scores. Table 9 contains the data utilized to evaluate attainment of this goal.

As can be determined by analyzing the data in Table 9, none of the grade levels at Carter attained the national norm level on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). The norm indices for reading, math, and the composite test are derived by dividing the national norm into the actual grade equivalent score. In the composite test data section, the only grade level close to the norm level was the fourth grade with a Norm Index of 93.

While the national norm goal was not attained, some of the grade levels were very effective in obtaining or going beyond the predicted score on the ITBS. The Predicted Achievement Index (PAI) is obtained by dividing the predicted score into the actual score. An index of 99 has been established as the score a grade must achieve to attain its Predicted Achievement Index (PAI). Looking at the Predicted Achievement Indices for the composite test data, four of the six grades were successful in meeting or going beyond their prediction. The teachers are to be commended for meeting this goal and going beyond the expectation.

The question of non-attainment of the national norm goal remains. Several explanations are appropriate. First, Carter is a school with a large percentage of lower socio-economic pupils and these pupils, in general, have poor reading ability. This is reflected in the low scores, especially in the upper grades, in reading and in math. When the pupils are beginning at a low level, it would be necessary to gain much more than the traditional one month for each month

TABLE 9

IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL 1973
PREDICTED SCORES AND NATIONAL NORMS

	Grade Equivalent Score			Summary Indices	
Grade	Actual	Predicted	National Norm	Predicted Achievement Index	National Norm Index
			Reading Test Data		
2	2.2	1.9	2.7	112	80
3	2.4	2.5	3.8	95	63
4	4.0	3.3	4.7	121	85
5	3.8	4.1	5.7	92	66
6	4.2	4.6	6.7	91	62
7	5.3	5.3	7.6	99	69
			AVERAGE	101	70
			Mathematics Test Data		
2	2.2	2.1	2.6	105	84
3	2.5	2.6	3.7	94	68
4	4.2	3.5	4.7	120	90
5	4.3	4.4	5.6	98	76
6	4.4	4.9	6.6	88	66
7	5.6	5.7	7.6	98	73
			AVERAGE	100	76
			COMPOSITE TEST DATA		
2	2.2	2.1	2.6	103	83
3	2.6	2.7	3.7	96	69
4	4.4	3.5	4.7	126	93
5	4.1	4.3	5.7	95	72
6	4.8	4.8	6.7	99	72
7	5.6	5.6	7.6	100	73
			AVERAGE	103	77

of instruction to attain the national norm. Secondly, the Atlanta School System has a commitment to improving reading for all pupils and does provide assistance to teachers in this area. However, teachers feel obligated to instruct in other areas such as the affective and psychomotor domains. Thirdly, teachers feel the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) was not a true measure of their pupils' abilities; the tests did not necessarily measure what was being taught.

E. Comprehensive Child Development Goal

The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) rating scale for preschool children was administered pre and post to the children at Carter who were in the program for a minimum of six months. The SREB scale measured the following areas: cognitive, social and emotional, motor skills, and hygiene and self-help. The goal for this program was that the children enrolled would perform at the equivalent to or above the age norms on the rating scale of the SREB. (See Table 10.)

There are various sections of the instrument for the two-year-old, three-year-old, and four-year-old child. The goal for this program was that the children enrolled would perform at the equivalent to or above the age norms on the rating scale of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). The data to evaluate attainment of this goal are contained in Table 10.

A very small percentage of the pupils in each of the three age groups scored at age level on the SREB; therefore, the goal for the Child Development Center was not attained. By looking at the variation in percentages, it is possible to ascertain the areas where the day care children at Carter are most deficient. For the two-year-old pupils, the greatest need is in the motor skills area and there are severe deficiencies in the cognitive, hygiene and self-help areas. For the three-year-old pupils, the greatest need is in the motor skills areas with deficiencies in the other three areas evaluated by the instrument. For the four-year-old pupils, the greatest need is in the cognitive areas, and there are severe deficiencies in the hygiene and self-help areas as well.

Reasons for non-attainment of the Child Development Center goal are numerous. First, the pupils with whom the day care personnel were working are from the lowest socio-economic families in the area or they would not qualify for a slot at the center. These pupils from lower socio-economic homes often lack the stimulation available

TABLE 10

SCORING ON SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD'S SCALE
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER
1972-73

	Ages			
	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.	Totals
Total Number of Pupils	5	15	18	38
Number Below Age Level				
Cognitive	4	9	18	31
Social and Emotional	1	8	11	20
Motor Skills	5	14	11	30
Hygiene and Self-help	4	3	17	24
Number at or Above Age Level				
Cognitive	1	5*	0	6
Social and Emotional	3*	7	7	17
Motor Skill	0	1	7	8
Hygiene and Self-help	1	12	1	14
Percentage Attaining the "At or Above Age Level" Goal				
Cognitive	20	33	0	16
Social and Emotional	60	47	39	45
Motor Skills	0	7	39	21
Hygiene and Self-help	20	80	6	37

*Missing Data

in some middle class homes. Secondly, six months at the center was the criteria for inclusion in the data analysis and there is some question as to the sufficiency of such a short time to overcome entry deficits. Thirdly, the 1972-73 school year was one of a small degree of turmoil in the funding source which provides the financial support for the Child Development Center. There were at least two different sets of guidelines issued regarding eligibility of the pupil participants. This confusion may have disrupted both the precision with which the staff at Carter was able to work as well as the emotional climate there in the Center.

VIII. COST ANALYSIS

A cost effectiveness analysis was completed for 1972-73 in an attempt to relate gains of the pupils on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) to cost per pupil; Table 11 contains the cost analysis data. Expenditures were separated into General Funds, salaried and nonsalaried, and into Compensatory Funds, salaried and nonsalaried. The figures used in the analysis were obtained from the General Funds Financial Report and the Trust and Agency Report for the 1973 fiscal year; the latter report contains the compensatory funds such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the funds from Title IV-A of the Social Security Act which were used to provide day care. The expenditure per pupil was based on the average daily attendance (ADA) of the pupils in each of the grade levels at Carter; the ADA range varied from a low of 23 in the 6th grade to a high of 89 in the 3rd grade. The enrollment in grades six and seven is lower because some of the potential pupils are enrolled in a middle school in the Carter district.

The ultimate purpose of the cost analysis was to calculate the cost per unit of the Predicted Achievement Index (PAI). The PAI was derived from a prediction of the grade equivalent on the April, 1973, ITBS for a particular grade; Spring, 1972, achievement test data were not available for the kindergarten and first grades and it is therefore impossible to obtain a PAI for these two levels. The predicted grade equivalent for each grade was the result of a regression formula which included the following variables: (1) The grade equivalent in the areas of reading and math computation on the spring, 1972 Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT); (2) Percentage of paid lunches; (3) Stability of pupil enrollment; (4) Percentage of attendance; and (5) Pupil-teacher ratio.

The Predicted Achievement Index (PAI) was obtained by dividing the actual grade equivalent on the spring, 1973 ITBS by the predicted grade equivalent. The data utilized for calculating the PAI for each grade at Carter 1972 included the following:

TABLE 11

COST ANALYSIS
1972-73
TOTAL AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE (Pre-K - 7 = 598)

	Grades									
	Pre-K	Kdg.	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Seventh	Average
Average Daily Attendance	34	58	79	76	89	84	81	23	74	66
Per Pupil Cost										
A. General Funds										
1. Regular										
a. Salary	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$574.68
b. Nonsalary	51.62	51.62	51.62	51.62	51.62	51.62	51.62	51.62	51.62	51.62
c. Total	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$6626.30
2. CIP										
a. Salary	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
b. Nonsalary	0	0	2.76	2.76	2.76	0	0	0	0	113.00
c. Total	$ 0	$ 0	$ 2.76	$ 2.76	$ 2.76	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 113.00
3. Total General Funds										
a. Salary	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68	$ 574.68
b. Nonsalary	51.62	51.62	54.38	54.38	54.38	51.62	51.62	51.62	51.62	52.75
c. Total	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 628.96	$ 628.96	$ 628.96	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 626.30	$ 627.43
B. Compensatory Funds										
1. Title I, ESEA										
a. Salary	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 101.02	$ 101.02	$ 101.02	$ 101.02	$ 101.02	$ 101.01	$ 72.13
b. Nonsalary	0	0	0	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.59
c. Total	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 101.85	$ 101.85	$ 101.85	$ 101.85	$ 101.85	$ 101.85	$ 72.72
2. Title I										
a. Salary	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 1.55
b. Nonsalary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. Total	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 2.17	$ 1.55
3. Kennedy, Dist. IV-A										
a. Salary	$2,019.90	$ 60.88	$ 60.88	$ 60.88	$ 60.88	$ 60.88	$ 60.88	$ 60.88	$ 60.88	$ 172.27
b. Nonsalary	68.57	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	5.85
c. Total	$2,088.47	$ 62.95	$ 62.95	$ 62.95	$ 62.95	$ 62.95	$ 62.95	$ 62.95	$ 62.95	$ 178.11
4. Title IV-A										
a. Salary	$ 653.07	$ 19.68	$ 19.68	$ 19.68	$ 19.68	$ 19.68	$ 19.68	$ 19.68	$ 19.68	$ 55.70
b. Nonsalary	63.04	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	5.38
c. Total	$ 716.11	$ 21.58	$ 21.58	$ 21.58	$ 21.58	$ 21.58	$ 21.58	$ 21.58	$ 21.58	$ 61.07
5. Total Compensatory Funds										
a. Salary	$2,672.97	$ 80.56	$ 80.56	$ 183.75	$ 183.75	$ 183.75	$ 183.75	$ 183.75	$ 183.75	$ 301.65
b. Nonsalary	131.61	3.97	3.97	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	11.82
c. Total	$2,804.58	$ 84.53	$ 84.53	$ 188.55	$ 188.55	$ 188.55	$ 188.55	$ 188.55	$ 188.55	$ 313.46
C. Total Per Pupil Cost										
1. Salary	$3,247.65	$ 655.24	$ 655.24	$ 655.24	$ 655.24	$ 655.24	$ 655.24	$ 655.24	$ 655.24	$ 802.64
2. Nonsalary	183.23	55.59	55.59	59.18	59.18	59.18	59.18	59.18	59.18	65.41
3. Total	$3,430.88	$ 710.83	$ 710.83	$ 714.42	$ 714.42	$ 714.42	$ 714.42	$ 714.42	$ 714.42	$ 868.05
Predicted Achievement Quotient	---	---	---	103	95	126	95	99	100	103
Cost Per Unit of Predicted Achievement Quotient										
A. General Funds	$ ---	$ ---	$ ---	$ 6.11	$ 6.55	$ 4.99	$ 6.62	$ 6.35	$ 6.29	$ 6.12
B. Compensatory Funds	---	---	---	1.83	1.96	1.50	1.99	1.91	1.89	1.84
C. Total	$ ---	$ ---	$ ---	$ 7.94	$ 7.51	$ 6.49	$ 8.61	$ 8.26	$ 8.18	$ 7.96

Grade	Predicted Grade Equivalent	Actual Grade Equivalent	Predicted Achievement Index
2	2.1	2.2	103
3	2.7	2.6	96
4	3.5	4.4	126
5	4.3	4.1	95
6	4.8	4.8	99
7	5.6	5.6	100

These various PAI's were divided into the expenditures in both the general and compensatory categories at Carter. There was little variability in the cost per unit of the PAI and a general conclusion would be acknowledgement that the cost per unit of PAI at Carter was approximately the same for each pupil.

IX. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the information included in this report and gathered through contact with the school during the school year with which this report is concerned the following conclusions and recommendations are drawn:

A. The Title I, English/Reading program needs to evaluate its procedures in reading instruction so greater gains can be attained for all the pupils. Perhaps expansion of the Youth-Tutoring-Youth and Tutor-Buddy programs would be a valuable procedure.

B. The Research and Developmeni Division personnel need to be more precise about administration of affective tests so more numerous pretest and posttest, with Title I pupils identified, will be available for analysis. The same need exists for more complete data of the reading tests administered by the Instructional Divison.

C. Because of the reading problem and the poor attitude for some of the grade levels, continued and increased effort should be made to involve parents and members of the community in the activities and instructional program of the school.

D. Efforts should be made to identify the successful practices and techniques that have helped to maintain a high level of achievement in certain grade levels for the 1972-73 school year.

E. If Title I, ESEA continues to advocate improvement in self-concept and attitude towards school, then some instructional assistance in this area should be provided for the Title I personnel.

F. Because the intermediate grade levels are the one which fall so far below the national norms on achievement tests, special efforts should be directed towards remedial work in these grades.

APPENDIX

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
By Dr. David J. Mullen

AS YOU WOULD LIKE IT 1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often 5 = Always			AS IT IS 1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often 5 = Always
1 2 3 4 5	1.	your superiors have confidence and trust in you	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	2.	you have confidence and trust in your superiors	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	3.	your superiors treat you in such a way that you have a feeling of importance and self-worth	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	4.	you feel free to discuss things with your superiors -- including problems which you are having in school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	5.	your superiors try to get and use your ideas and opinions on school life and work problems	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	6.	your physical needs and safety are taken care of	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	7.	your peers treat you in such a way that you have a feeling of importance and self-worth	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	8.	you follow rules and ways of doing things because you have had a part in deciding them	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	9.	you are working toward goals and are doing things in school which have meaning for you	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	10.	conflicts (problems) which come up in school are in such a way that both sides of the problem are taken into account	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	11.	members of the school feel a responsibility to try to improve school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	12.	members of the school organization are kind, cooperative, and helpful to each other	1 2 3 4 5

AS YOU WOULD LIKE IT 1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often 5 = Always			AS IT IS 1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often 5 = Always
1 2 3 4 5	13.	you are satisfied to be in a school situation like this one	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	14.	individuals and groups communicate to improve school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	15.	information about things which will improve school life and work comes from members of the school organization, (superiors, peers, and people lower than you)	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	16.	you believe that the information which your superiors give you about school life and work is accurate, and if not, you question them about it	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	17.	you give superiors a great deal of information about you and your school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	18.	you feel responsible to tell your superiors about things related to your school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	19.	you "tell it like it is" to your superiors	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	20.	you "tell it like it is" to your peers	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	21.	you feel close and friendly with your superiors	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	22.	your superiors know and understand the problems you face in your school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	23.	you understand how your superiors view things and they understand your point of view	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	24.	you have many chances to communicate and work with your peers in a friendly way	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	25.	cooperative team work is used	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	26.	you are able to bring about changes in the goals, methods, and activities	1 2 3 4 5

AS YOU WOULD LIKE IT 1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often 5 = Always			AS IT IS 1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often 5 = Always
1 2 3 4 5	27.	your supervisors work with you in such a way that you willingly give careful attention to their suggestions about the goals, activities and methods you use in your work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	28.	the school is organized in such a way that your ideas and views have a chance to influence the decisions which are made about your school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	29.	decision making is spread throughout groups rather than having the decisions made by someone at the top and passed down	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	30.	information from those who "know how it really is" and information based upon information rather than "guessing" is used for making decisions	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	31.	whoever makes the decisions which affect you is aware of problems and circumstances you are facing	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	32.	you are able to take part in improving the school situation when you have something important to offer	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	33.	the way decisions are made helps you feel that you are part of the "team," that you, your feelings, and opinions "count" as being important	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	34.	decisions are made by groups and problems are dealt with to some degree by the group closest to the problem	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	35.	you take part in making decisions which affect your school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	36.	school life and work activities which affect you are usually developed by you or a group which represents you, rather than being developed by your superiors then handed down as "orders"	1 2 3 4 5

AS YOU WOULD LIKE IT 1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often 5 = Always			AS IT IS 1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very Often 5 = Always
1 2 3 4 5	37.	the members of the school organization try to set high goals for their school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	38.	you accept the goals for school life and work and try your best to implement them	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	39.	members of the school organization feel some responsibility for controlling their own behavior rather than superiors acting like policemen making sure that everybody does what they are supposed to do	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	40.	there is complete and accurate information to guide your group's work and school life behavior	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	41.	you take a part in judging your own work and activities rather than this being done just by your supervisors	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	42.	you share in having control over your school life and work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	43.	information about how you are doing your work is used to help your superiors know what they need to do to help you rather than used by your superiors to evaluate you	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	44.	your superiors seek to have you achieve high but realistic goals	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	45.	you seek to achieve high but realistic goals	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	46.	you receive training and special assistance to improve your work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	47.	your previous training has provided you with the knowledge and skills important to doing your work now	1 2 3 4 5